



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
[www.uspto.gov](http://www.uspto.gov)

H

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/058,338	01/30/2002	Robert G. Watkins	06975-232001	6135
26171	7590	03/03/2006	EXAMINER	
FISH & RICHARDSON P.C. P.O. BOX 1022 MINNEAPOLIS, MN 55440-1022			VU, THONG H	
		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	2142

DATE MAILED: 03/03/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

<b>Office Action Summary</b>	<b>Application No.</b>	<b>Applicant(s)</b>	
	10/058,338	WATKINS, ROBERT G.	
	Examiner Thong H. Vu	Art Unit 2142	

— The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address —  
**Period for Reply**

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

#### Status

1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 13 February 2006.

2a) This action is FINAL.                  2b) This action is non-final.

3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

#### Disposition of Claims

4) Claim(s) 1-92 is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.

6) Claim(s) 1-92 is/are rejected.

7) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.

8) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

#### Application Papers

9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10) The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.  
 Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
 Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

#### Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a) All    b) Some \* c) None of:  
 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.  
 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.  
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

#### Attachment(s)

1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)

2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)

3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)  
 Paper No(s)/Mail Date \_\_\_\_\_.

4) Interview Summary (PTO-413)  
 Paper No(s)/Mail Date. \_\_\_\_\_.

5) Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)

6) Other: \_\_\_\_\_.

1. Claims 1-92 are pending. Claims 1,19,32,50,63,79 have been amended. Thus the Final action is proper.

***Response to Arguments***

2. Applicant's arguments, see pages 2-8, filed 2/13/06, with respect to Cane-Kataoka have been fully considered and are persuasive. The Final Rejection of Cane-Kataoka has been withdrawn. However, based on the applicant arguments the Final Rejection based on Rahman-Cane is followed:

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 1-92 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103 as being unpatentable over Bin Abdul Rahman et al [Rahman 2002/0184501 A1] in view of Cane [5,416,840].

3. As per claim 63, Rahman discloses an apparatus for identifying an unauthorized client communication system seeking access to a host communication system, the apparatus comprising:

a performing device structured and arranged to perform a mathematical computation on an access password and a client-communication-system-specific identifier [Rahman, calculation formula, password and public key, 0047] and

a designating device structured and arranged to designate a client communication system as unauthorized based on a result of the mathematical computation [Rahman, verify the authenticity of the user information, 0027].

However Rahman does not explicitly detail wherein the client communication system specific identifier is derived from information that identifies at least a hardware component (or aspect of the client communication system).

Cane discloses a program using encryption scheme including the password and hardware ID [Cane, abstract]

Therefore it would have been obvious to an ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate technique of encoding the hardware ID and user password as taught by Cane into the Rahman's apparatus in order to provide a demand for more reliable security system to protect information in storage media from unauthorized access and to ensure safe delivery.

4. As per claim 64, Rahman-Cane disclose the mathematical computation comprises a hashing algorithm [Cane, encrypted authorization code, col 7 lines 1-8].

5. As per claim 65, Rahman-Cane disclose the mathematical computation is performed when a communication is initiated [Cane, a formula, col 7 lines 40-65].

6. As per claim 66,67 Rahman-Cane disclose the access password comprises a subscriber password [Cane, password, col 4 lines 26-36].
7. As per claim 68, Rahman-Cane disclose the access password comprises an account password as inherent feature of user password.
8. As per claim 69, Rahman-Cane disclose the client-communication-system-specific identifier varies based on the client communication system [Cane, hardware identifier, col 5 lines 20-43].
9. As per claim 70, Rahman-Cane disclose the client-communication-system-specific identifier comprises a device-specific identifier system [Cane, hardware Identifier, col 5 lines 20-43].
10. As per claims 71,74 Rahman-Cane disclose the device-specific identifier comprises a hard disk identifier system [Cane, hardware Identifier, col 5 lines 20-43].
11. As per claim 72, Rahman-Cane disclose the device-specific identifier comprises an Ethernet address [Cane, a wired or wireless network, col 4 lines 57-68].
12. As per claim 73, Rahman-Cane disclose the device-specific identifier comprises a central processing unit serial number [Cane, a host processor, col 4 lines 15-25].

13. As per claim 78, Rahman-Cane disclose a device structured and arranged to terminate communications from the client communication system if the result of the first mathematical computation does **not** correspond to result of the host-based mathematical computation [Cane, not arithmetically computable, col 6 lines 35-45].

14. Claim 79 contain the similar limitations set forth in the apparatus claim 63. Therefore claim 79 is rejected for the same rationale set forth in the apparatus claim 63.

15. As per claim 80,81 Rahman-Cane disclose the performing device includes a device for storing the result of the mathematical computation comprises storing the result on the client communication system, a performing device for performing a mathematical computation comprises performing the mathematical computation at the client communication system, and an access password storing device for storing the access password comprises storing the result on the host communication system [Cane, a working copy, col 3 lines 28-38].

16. As per claim 82, Rahman-Cane disclose device structured and arranged to store the result on the client communication system [Cane, a working copy, col 3 lines 28-38].

17. Claims 83-92 contain the similar limitations set forth in the apparatus claims 64,66-74. Therefore claims 83-92 are rejected for the same rationale set forth in the apparatus claims 64,66-74.

18. Claims 1-12;19-43; 50-62 contain the similar limitations set forth in the apparatus claims 63-74,78-92. Therefore claims 1-12;19-43;50-62 are rejected for the same rationale set forth in the apparatus claims 63-74,78-92.

19. As per claim 75, Rahman-Cane disclose a first computation result device structured and arranged to retrieve a result of  
a first mathematical computation performed on the access password and the client-communication-system-specific identifier, [Rahman, calculation formula, password and public key, 0047]  
a retrieving device structured and arranged to retrieve the client-communication-system-specific identifier from the client communication system [Rahman, verify the authenticity of the user information, 0027], and  
a device structured and arranged to retrieve a version (i.e.: a copy) of the access password located on the host communication system, [Cane, a working copy, col 3 lines 39-52]  
wherein the performing device comprises a device for performing the mathematical computation at the host using the retrieved version of the access password located on the host communication system and the client-communication-

system-specific identifier [Cane, a host processor, hardware identifier, password, col 4 lines 15-25]

the designating device comprises a device for designating the client communication system as unauthorized based on whether the result of the first mathematical computation corresponds to the result of the host-based mathematical computation [Cane, against unauthorized access, col 8 lines 45-68].

20. As per claims 76,77 Rahman-Cane disclose retrieving the first mathematical computation result comprises a device for retrieving the result of the first mathematical computation from the client communication system as inherent feature of the predefined formula and compares it [Cane, formula, col 7 lines 40-col 8 line 3].

21. Claims 13-15;44-46 contain the similar limitations set forth in the apparatus claims 75-77. Therefore claims 13-18;44-49 are rejected for the same rationale set forth in the apparatus claims 75-77.

22. As per claims 16-18 Rahman-Cane disclose sending a notification to the client communication system indicating the designation of the client communication system as an unauthorized client communication system if the result of the first mathematical computation does **not** correspond to the result of the host-based mathematical computation [Cane, not arithmetically computable, col 6 lines 35-45].

23. Claims 47-49 contain the similar limitations set forth in claims 16-18. Therefore claims 47-49 are rejected for the same rationale set forth in claims 16-18.

**THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to examiner *Thong Vu*, whose telephone number is (571)-272-3904. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Thursday from 6:00AM-3:30PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, *Andrew Caldwell*, can be reached at (571) 272-3868. The fax number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval IPAIRI system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PMR or Public PMR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

*Thong Vu*  
*Primary Examiner*  
*Art Unit 2142*

